

NORTH-WESTERN CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

HE THAT DOETH TRUTH COMETH TO THE LIGHT, THAT HIS DEEDS MAY BE MADE MANIFEST
THAT THEY ARE OF GOD.—*Messiah.*

VOL. IV. CINCINNATI, APRIL, 1858.

No. 10.

For the N. W. Christian Magazine.

Apologies for Slavery—No. 5.

"Some Slaveholders are good men."
Grant it. But did the institution of slavery make them good men? If it did, then, is this *even* more than an apology—it is a commendation upon the system of slavery. If slaveholding made them good, then, they were bad before they became masters. Now, if the simple fact of a man's becoming a master makes a man good, who before was a bad man, then is the institution at least half good; and if becoming a slave will make the negro good, who before was bad, then is the institution wholly good—*all over good*. Then is the "tree good," and *per* consequence, "the fruit good," "for the tree is known by his fruit," as men are known by their behavior, and systems are known by their result.

Aristides was a good man, and so was Socrates. Did Pagan idolatry make them good? If so, then let us call our foreign missionaries home. For Christianity can do no more than make good men, unless we use the word *good* in a comparative sense.

Robert Owen was, without controversy, a good man. He was a benevolent man; he was an honest man—there was not a taint upon his char-

acter. He spent his life in devising and executing a scheme of beneficence. He devoted, as himself and others honestly supposed, his naturally good and great heart to doing good. But, was the good and unblamable life of Robert Owen, the legitimate result of his *sheer-bald Atheism*?

If Atheistical sentiments naturally tend to make men good, the exceptions cannot be urged as an offset against the system which boldly declares "there is no God." But will the history of Atheism furnish another Owen? The Owens are the exceptions in the rule, while the Voltaires, the Rosseaus, the Robespierres, the Marats, and the Dantons, come under the rule. There have been a few good, honorable, high-minded skeptics, but the Jeffersons are the few, while the Paines are the many. There are good Papists and bad Protestants. There have been *humane despots* and *tyrannical despots*. During the first three hundred years of the Christian era, there was one Trajan but many Neroes. Men are sometimes better than their systems, and sometimes worse. Sometimes the heart is better than the head, as in the case of Robert Owen; and sometimes the head and the heart are alike bad, as in the case of Monsieur Voltaire. The product of a bad creed and a bad heart,

is a bad man,—to this rule there is no exception. The product of a good creed and a good heart, is a good man,—to this rule there never was an exception; while it is true that there have been (to speak after the manner of men,) a few good men under the vilest systems—men, who advocated the most corrupt principles. When the moral sentiments have the preponderance, they may have more controlling power than the license granted by a pernicious theory, and in some instances the sentiments adopted, and virtuous habits acquired in early life, are an ample protection against “evil communications.” Upon these facts *only*, can we account for that *anomaly*, a good slaveholder. As a class, slaveholders are not good men. Nay, slaveholders, slave traders, and slave drivers, (the last two originating in the first,) are usually bad men, *very bad men*. Who will dare contradict this statement? The system never made a good man, neither can it prevent the bad from becoming worse. The system has no tendency to justice, mercy, or benevolence, but all its motive power is in an opposite direction. These divine qualities never seek for display in holding men in a degraded position; but on the other hand, they strive to elevate. It is impossible, even with that “charity that thinketh no evil,” to reconcile that condescension and humility enjoined in the gospel, with that lordly domination which every slave master is compelled to exercise over his slave. In the language of another—“The intercourse between a master and a slave, however kind and generous the former, and however pliant and obedient the latter, is on the one side essentially *dogmatical, absolute, and lordly*; on the other side, *cringing, abject, and servile*. Master and servant, it is true, are correlative terms; but not more so than tyrant and slave. We may indeed have severe masters and mild tyrants—surly

servants and agreeable slaves. But, there is a lawless absolutism on the part of the slave-master, and an unrestricted submission on the part of his slave, that constitutes the essential and differential attributes of the relation; while there is but a limited authority on the part of the ordinary master, and reserved rights on the part of the hired servant, that, compared with the former, render the latter relation safe, virtuous, and honorable.”

At this time, the author of the foregoing extract was an abolitionist. He then thought as an abolitionist, and therefore spoke as an abolitionist. He was now pleading with the people of Kentucky to so revise their State Constitution, as to abolish slavery by gradual emancipation. He then spoke of the relation of master and slave as it is. Being himself a resident of a slave State, and having frequently visited other slave States, he had doubtlessly seen slavery in its best features. As a minister of the gospel, his associations would be with church members, “good slaveholders,” and yet he was in favor of abolition. In the light of this quotation, the apology at the head of this article—“some slaveholders are good men,”—must be greatly abated. No good man, not to say good Christian man, will stand in a relation that is “*essentially dogmatical, absolute, and lordly*,” and hold others in a condition where they must be “*cringing, abject, and servile*.” No good man will exercise “*a lawless absolutism*” over his fellow men. “The Princes of the Gentiles” could do this without damage to themselves, but whether a Disciple of Jesus Christ can do this, let this word of his decide: “Ye know that the Princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them, but it shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister,” etc. Matt. 20: 25, 26. If the apologist means to

say good Christian, we must say no, for Christ's sake. The dominion of the Gentile princes was the mildest form of authority, compared with the "lawless absolutism of the slave master." It would not be true in the main, that their rule was "a lawless absolutism," neither would it be true in the general, that their subjects were "cringing and servile." There is no relation known among men, in which the differential attributes are "a lawless absolutism" on the one side, and an unrestricted submission on the other side, save this of master and slave. Our author says, this is "essentially" so in this relation. Hence, he concludes, that as the ordinary master has but a limited authority, and the hired servant reserved rights, that this "latter relation is safe, virtuous, and honorable." This is saying, by fair implication, that the extraordinary relation of "master and slave" is neither "safe, virtuous, nor honorable." Now, we ask for the sake of more light on the subject, will a good man enter into this relation, or continue in it after he has, by the grace of God, become a good man?

If the *Harbinger* has changed his sentiments as it respects this relation, (as some suppose,) since he published that most excellent address to the citizens of Kentucky, he should in all candor have informed his readers. We do not say that he has. We believe, that his great and generous heart is as much opposed to this relation as at any former period of his life. Our venerable brother was not an impulsive youth, when he so faithfully and so truthfully described the shocking qualities of this relation. These qualities are essential to its very being. Without "lawless absolutism" being brought to bear upon the slave in such a way as to secure "servile submission," the relation cannot exist. No enlightened Christian can give his approval to such a relation, and therefore

no good man, in the light of Christian appreciation, can be a slaveholder, inasmuch as his relation to his slave, or slaves, is wholly irreconcilable with Christian relations and duties.

The Apostles of Jesus Christ saw this "lawless absolutism" on the side of the masters, therefore they said unto them—"And ye masters"—"forbearing threatening," "knowing that your Master, also, is in Heaven—neither is there respect of persons with him." "Masters, give to your servants that which is just and equal," etc. This done, and the master is no longer a "lawless absolute" master—the "differential attributes" of the relation have ceased, and when these are no more, the relation is virtually abolished.

The Christian religion does not allow one man, by "lawless absolutism," to invade the rights of another. The truth of this statement will not be controverted, by professed believers in our blessed Lord and Savior. There might, however, be some debate as to what human rights are, both natural and social. Social rights have not been the same in all ages and in all lands. These being defined by the order of society in which we may happen to live, are, therefore, changeable, but should never conflict with natural rights,—these being derived from the Creator, are therefore the common inheritance of all. Good men will not infringe upon the admitted social rights of other men, much less upon their natural rights—rights clearly indicated by the will of God, and hence called equal rights. It is only necessary to state what these rights are, to show that the "good slaveholder" is just as guilty of invading and striking down the most sacred rights of our common humanity, as the worst slaveholder.

"Whatever (says A. Campbell,) the natural rights of men are, they belong to all men naturally, consequently, the natural rights of men are equal rights. For whatever belongs to all men natu-

rally, must equally belong to all. To give to others what belongs to them, is a duty we owe them;—to withhold from them what belongs to them, is a sin. There can be no favor, donation, or gift, in conferring natural rights upon others, for natural rights cannot be conferred—they belong to man, merely, because he exists. Now, if it be duty to give to others what belongs to them, it is our duty not to invade the rights of others, but to protect and guarantee them.

“Whatever a man has received from his Creator, it is right for him to preserve. He owes it to Heaven and himself. He is bound by the relation in which he stands to the Donor, and by the laws of his own Constitution, to preserve it. And in the second place, whatever a man has acquired by the consent of society in which he lives, he has a right to possess and maintain. The former is the principle or basis of natural rights—the latter, the principle or basis of political rights. The former are invariably the same—the latter vary according to circumstances. Man has received certain animal and intellectual endowments; to these he has an underived right, as respects human society, to possess and retain. To preserve life, to preserve happiness, or to seek food and entertainment for mind and body, is the right and duty of all men.” * * * * * “All persons then who are of full age, are equally free. Of these we say, that liberty is a natural, inherent, and inalienable right. To preserve life, to form character, to acquire property, are the equal rights of all. To defend life, reputation, and property, is the common and inherent right of all.”—(See Christian Baptist, 8th edition, pages 569 and 570.)

This bill of human rights is either true or false. That it is true, and its basis true, is attested by every man's conscience—by the Bible—by nature—by the Declaration of American In-

dependence—by every jurist—by every righteous judge, ancient or modern, dead or living. With this clear and convincing statement of human rights as our *premise*, we are left to think, and we might as well say it—for then the thoughts of the heart may be corrected, if wrong—that the “good slaveholder” is a rude, remorseless invader of other men's rights; that he is both a thief and a robber, in the most aggravated sense of these terms. The man that would invade his neighbor's rights in the value of a pig, or a lamb, would be called a thief. Why not call a man a thief who forcibly deprives another of the right to “preserve life—to pursue happiness—to seek food and entertainment for both his body and his mind—to form character—to acquire property—and to defend himself in the acquisition and possession of these. The good slaveholder does all this, and more, by “lawless absolutism,” and yet his friend apologist “delights to do him honor,” and calls him “good man,” and, perhaps, “good Christian” too. If all that slaveholders are compelled to do, and are doing, to maintain their position towards their “scrining, abject, servile” vassals, may be done, and yet be good men, and good Christians,—when convinced of this, we shall be ready for any thing that may suit our convenience, or gratify our passions.

Good slaveholders are yet to be viewed from another point of observation. If to divide slaveholders into two classes—the bad and the good—and call the latter the more culpable, we should be thought, by many, to be invidious or insane. This, notwithstanding, is our firm conviction. This class are the best informed. Their superior knowledge of things in general, and Bible information in particular, makes them, as a class, more responsible to God and man than the former. The ignorance of many may palliate their case somewhat; but, these styled

"good" by the apologist are not of that class. The more intelligence and goodness a man possesses, the clearer will be his perception of things right and wrong, and the higher must be his appreciation of the "things that are excellent." When we place a high estimate upon liberty, education, social relations, inheritance, etc., we then have in ourselves the true standard of valuation as it respect others. If gold is so valuable that one man will murder another to obtain it, and thereby subject himself to the gallows, what must it be worth to the owner? If the natural rights of men, as defined in the foregoing extract, are so desirable, that our fathers would defend them for seven long years of bloody conflict, with sword in hand, what must their intrinsic value be to all?—for natural rights are common rights—"equal rights." The more intelligent and virtuous slaveholders are capable of placing a just estimate upon the "rights" God has invested in every man,—because he is a man,—because it was the Creator's good pleasure that he should be a man; while the more gross, sensual, ignorant slaveholder, is incapable of such appreciation. Still, the "good" slaveholder is as *truly* a slaveholder as the bad slaveholder. His general bearing toward his slaves may be more humane and merciful; but, his guilt before God may be *even* greater than that of the former, while the chiding of his own conscience must be more pungent and severe. Many striking examples might be cited in proof of this remark. But our space will permit but one:—"In the name of God, Amen! I, John Randolph, of Roanoke, in the county of Charlotte, do ordain this writing, written with mine own hand this fourth day of May, one thousand eight hundred and nineteen, to be my last will and testament, hereby revoking all others whatsoever. I give to my slaves their freedom, to which my conscience

tells me they are justly entitled." His conscience had often told him this before, but he was deaf to its warnings and reproofs until now. The near approach of death enlightens no man's conscience; but it does sometimes remove the restraints imposed upon it. It sometimes makes a man honest,—then conscience speaks out, and would fain make some amends for past delinquency. John Randolph was a "good slaveholder." The best evidence a slaveholder can give of his being a "good" man, is to emancipate his slaves. But, notwithstanding this act of justice to these defrauded, injured men, when he could no longer enjoy the benefits of unrequited toil, his troubled conscience extorted from his lips, when on his dying bed—Remorse! Remorse!! Remorse!!! The reason of this *remorse* may be inferred, in part, at least, from the rebuke he gave Edward Everett, in 1820: "*Sir, I neither envy the head nor the heart of that man from the North, who rises here to defend slavery upon principle.*" When death looks sternly into a man's face, he wants the testimony of his own conscience that the actions of his life were controlled by correct principles. How few of the "good slaveholders"—church members—give *even* as much evidence of goodness as this eminent statesman? Did John Randolph believe the *cant* and *hypocrisy* of the pro-slavery ministry; i. e., that the Bible justified slavery? If he neither envied the head nor the heart of a politician who would rise to defend slavery upon principle, could he do otherwise than look with supreme contempt upon a professed minister of righteousness, who would "rise" to defend slavery by an appeal to the Bible? If he was so ignorant (as many are) of what the Bible teaches upon the subject, he could but despise the preacher and his Bible. An attempt to defend slavery upon any principle of natural, moral or divine right, is the

highest insult that can be offered to a man's understanding. The man that will undertake to do what shocks reason, must assume that his auditors are *fools*.

John Randolph, upon his own admission, held his slaves, contrary to every principle of right. This every "good slaveholder" knows to be the true state of the case. The worst class of slaveholders may not know this. They are slaveholders as a matter of course. They have never inquired into their own rights, nor yet into the wrongs of their slaves. These have put the institution to shame. They bring it into disrepute. But the "good slaveholders"—good, Christian slaveholders—make ample amends for all this damage. They take away the reproach; they cause the offense to cease. It is not the institution that is at fault, but it is the men—the bad slaveholders. Ah! yes, that alters the case. If one man can be a good Christian slaveholder, why not another? Why not all slaveholders be good men?—good Christians, says the apologist. They might be, and should be, provided only that you say what is true, that some slaveholders are good men. But suppose these good *men*—slaveholders—are upholding a bad, wicked system; what *then* becomes of your good men? The "good slaveholders" are doing *this*, and the bad slaveholders are enjoying the sufferance of society upon the credit of the "good slaveholders." The "good slaveholders" make the system popular at home, and respectable abroad. These make a favorable impression on Northern visitors—merchants, ministers, soliciting agents for Bible and missionary purpose, etc. If these associations were generally with the other class, the impression would be different. Then, the worst features would be brought to light. But now the stranger sees but little, and then only the more comely parts. Hence, through the better part of slave-

holders, a false view of the system is received abroad, and the system is not seen as it is. Every system of organized wickedness is sustained in the same way, by a one-sided, false view. With small exceptions, the professional gamblers and *blacklegs*, are but the offshoots of a very different class of men—or, perhaps, better say, fellows. Men, reputed to be good men, respectable men, play chess, cards, etc., for amusement. Boys and young men are in this way initiated into these mysteries. Many of these do not stop with amusement *only*, as did their more respectable tutors. That which was taught them in the way of innocent amusement, becomes a temptation for gaming. Then, there is the gentlemanly gambler. This class are generally known as sedate, orderly, correct business men. They so manage, before the public gaze, that no one would suspect them, save their skulking companions. Then, there is another class, who are not above suspicion, called good men notwithstanding; men occupying honorable official stations in society. And because of their wealth and general popularity, this defect is overlooked, and they pass for good men. This respect awarded to them, gives them influence, and that influence is prostituted to the most base and ignoble purposes. If such men were abhorred and desecrated by all, as they should be, the influence of their example could not be so ruinous and seductive. Systematic gambling, in the aggregate, is clearly traceable to these beginnings, and what the world calls "good men." All the recruits that keep up the system, come from this source. The same is true of the desolations of intemperance. It begins with that which is admissible, honorable and virtuous—that which a good man may do without damage to himself, his trade, his profession, or his religion; that is, use intoxicating drinks as a beverage, habitually, daily,

provided only he shall drink moderately, temperately. These, other things being equal, are, nevertheless, "good men." They are more abundantly honored than other men. They are called temperate. What an honor, to be called temperate! Let this be awarded to a man, and he wears the finest wreath of honor society can bestow. Hence, to be a *temperate drinker* is honorable. But, we must confess, we are rather sceptical as respects the merited honor of such temperate drinkers. We are not sure that the word temperate is justly dealt with, when used as a prefix to drinker—a drinker of intoxicating liquors. Are the words temperate and drinker correlates? The word *temperate* describes one of those divine virtues, which ornament and embellish the christian character; and the word drinker—a habitual drinker of ardent spirits, according to Webster, is a tippler. The word tippler means both the drunkard and the falsely so called temperate drinker. The word temperate cannot be used in an ill sense, and the word tippler can not be used in a good sense. Temperate drinker is, therefore, a shameful prostitution of the word temperate. In this connection, it is forced to sanction a vice; and, by association, the most degrading, the most ruinous of all the vices, is transferred into a virtue—a popular virtue. The incipient stages of drunkenness are made respectable, by misnaming the tippler, and by calling such men *temperate*, we lend them our influence; we arm them with power for the work of ruin. This we do, notwithstanding our irresistible conviction that the temperate drinkers are the real cause—the sole cause—of general drunkenness. To recognize such as good men, temperate men, etc., is only to make the business of making and selling ardent spirits respectable, and the beginnings of a life of drunkenness every way consistent with the most exalted christian

virtues. In this way, intemperance in the aggregate is sustained. It is by the patronage of to be good, etc., that it exists at all. Just as the temperate drinker stands to general drunkenness, so stands the "good slaveholder" to slavery in the aggregate—as a whole. This is true of all organized wickedness—houses of ill fame not excepted. If those only who are wholly under their influence—those who have thrown off every restraint—were their only support, no such organic evils could ever become elements of society. If the temperate drinkers were suddenly converted from the error of their ways, drunkenness would soon cease from off the earth; and if the "good slaveholders" would presently manumit their slaves, slavery would soon be numbered among the things that were. But, we use the word "good" only in a relative sense, not in the sense of the apologist. The word *slave*, whatever might have been its original import, is now used only in an *ill* or *degraded* sense. A slave is a degraded man. In the language of Thomas Jefferson: "*The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions; the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and the most degrading submission on the other.*" Degradation enters into the very definition of *slave*. Hence, by a figure of speech, we call those slaves, who are overcome by some degrading vice. An avaricious man is a slave to this world. The slaves of lust, of passion, of wine, of tobacco, of sin, etc. The leading ideas in the word *slave*, are, degradation, servility, meanness; and the word holder means possessor. Slave is the prefix to holder. A slaveholder is, then, the holder of a degraded, servile, mean man. But, when it is understood that he has made him so, and holds him fast in that condition, I will not consent to call a slaveholder a good man.

King Alcohol is an extensive slave-

holder; "for of whom a man is overcome, of the same he is brought in bondage." 2 Peter 2:19. This slaveholder bears the same relation to his slaves, that American slaveholders do to their slaves. He has brought them into subjection; they are under his dominion; and, inasmuch as this dominion is a source of profit, his lordship is stoutly opposed to manumission. The abolitionists (temperance pleaders) he regards as invaders of his rights, his implacable enemies. Notwithstanding the number of his slaves, the vast extent of his dominions, and the multitude of apologizing friends; he is, nevertheless, a bad, wicked prince, a cruel master. And what, if his friends, in the ardor of their devotion, call him a "good man," is he, *therefore*, a "good man?" To call evil good, and good evil, is no new thing under the sun. It is one of the most effectual devices of the wicked one. By misnaming things and persons, their qualities are concealed, and vices become virtues, and virtues vices; bad men are esteemed good men, and good men are reputed to be bad men. This is sinning with a "cart rope." This is drawing "iniquity with cords." "Woe unto them that draw iniquity with cords of vanity, and sin as it were with a cart rope." "Woe unto them that call evil good," (say concerning evil, it is good, marginal reading) "and good, it is evil," etc. Isaiah 5:18-20. Bad men may bring a good cause into disrepute; so apparently good men, by espousing a bad cause, may make it respectable; still, the systems are intrinsically the same. But, will a truly good man—a godly man—espouse such a cause as American Slavery? There is something most fearful in the admission; and yet, an unqualified denial might do injustice to some, if it be true, as some say, that some hold their slaves from necessity, or as a choice between evils. That to hold them is wrong, but to manumit them is to inflict upon them a greater

wrong. There may be some slaveholders who are exceptions to the general rule; but these, as in other cases, cannot affect the general result. If there are any, who were made masters without their consent, and continue to be masters contrary to their wishes, these should be pitied. If a good man is coerced into a position he is not willing to occupy, if in that position he feels conscious that his influence is in a wrong direction, he will right his position when possible. And in the meantime, he will so husband the influence of his good name, that it shall not be even auxiliary to a system his judgment condemns. But, such are not, in the true sense of the word, slaveholders; neither are their slaves destined to perpetual bondage. There will be a time when the alternatives of a good master and manumission will be no longer matters of choice; when the present good master can no longer be master, and another, he knows not who, will have to be. Then, every man who stands in the relation of master from benevolent considerations, will do as John Randolph did; he will manumit his slaves. But such, like angels' visits, are so few and far between, that they cannot be taken into the account. And, if it were even admissible to call such slaveholders good men, it would yet be questionable propriety to do so. "If," said John to his brother George, "late sowed wheat should happen to yield a good crop, fathers should never tell their sons." This suggestion showed, at least, some forecast. If true in one case out of nine hundred and ninety-nine, better tell it not to the young farmer.

And, if there are a few involuntary slaveholders, to whom the appellation *good men* might be awarded in justice to themselves; it should, nevertheless, be withheld, unless with the accompanying specifications.

"Some slaveholders are good men,"

is an "evil communication." It corrupts good manners. It makes sad havoc with good morals. To make one man believe that another man may voluntarily become a slaveholder—continue a slaveholder—die a slaveholder—be a good man—a good Christian—is only to convince him that goodness and Christianity are not rigid in their demands. In this case, unbelief is the only safety, and belief is ruin—moral ruin. For, if a good man may practice the greatest evil, he may the least. And, so far as the apology is received, slavery is profited, and sound morality is damaged.

If none participated in the legalized sins of society, but such as are worthy of licensed iniquity, such as intemperance and slavery, would soon work their own destruction. If none but libertines, and admitted conspirators against God and man, defended slavery, its fall would be speedy and inevitable. But, men have espoused it, both theoretically and practically, of whom the system is not worthy; and, in many instances, the overshadowing influence of a few great names makes that respectable and right, which would otherwise be *loathed* and *abhorred* by all good men. The *position* these idols of our apologists occupy, is the sugar in the poisoned loaf. They are whited sepulchres; they are covert pitfalls, over which other men, and often better men, stumble into destruction.

JONAS HARTZEL.

Davenport, Iowa.

For the N. W. Christian Magazine.

Requisitions of the Gospel—No. 10.

DIVISION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT—No. 3.

Having been introduced to the world in the character of the Son of God, the lovely Redeemer goes about doing good, relieving the ills and woes of suffering humanity, and proclaiming liberty to the sin-bound captives of

Satan. Finally the sad season of his last suffering arrives. The most important event connected with the great scheme of human redemption—an event the result of which the heavenly and Satanic hosts alike await with the most intense anxiety, is on the eve of transpiring. The deep hatred and malice of the children of Abraham towards Jesus of Nazareth are about to be satiated in his ignominious death upon the cross. Having forsaken the footsteps of the patriarchs of old, and unheeding of the Light of Life, the Jews, the highly favored people of the Lord, are filled with anxiety to perpetrate the cruel deed of death, thereby intending the utter extermination of the new religion from the face of the earth. Behold the immaculate Savior as he for the last time wends his way to the Garden of Gethsemane, that lone retreat where he has been accustomed often to resort for prayer. Methinks the twilight gleams have faded in the Western skies, and the seven stars have climbed high up in the heavens. The sable pinions of night silently brood over the face of nature, and the chill dews of eve rest down upon the head of the Devoted One. The solemn accents of the whispering gale are heard among the mountain trees, while the pale misty gleams of moonlight cast a mellow radiance over the sorrowful scene. As the solemn tones of prayer are borne upon the winds, great drops of sweat, as of blood, bedew the face of the Son of God, and fall down to the ground. And as thus in agony the Savior pours forth his soul in prayer to his Father, the reckless traitor, inspired with the spirit of Satan, enters the sequestered vale of Kedron. Jesus yields himself into the hands of the cruel emissaries of the Prince of Darkness, and though he has led a life of innocence and purity, and his tongue has been eloquent in proclaiming to the sinful and perishing family of man the immortal truths of

heaven, yet is he numbered among transgressors, and accounted worthy to suffer the ignominious death of the Cross. He is first brought before Anas, the late high priest, who interrogates him concerning his disciples and his doctrine. Jesus in response declares that as he has taught nothing privately, the Jews can testify in regard to his doctrine. He is next brought into the palace of Caiaphas, the high priest, and cruelly arraigned before a convention of hollow-hearted priests and elders. An effort is now made to secure false witnesses, but none sufficient can be obtained. The depositions of suborned witnesses disagree, and not even the semblance of testimony can be adduced to sully the spotless character of the Son of Mary. While the most groundless charges are preferred against him, before a tribunal more corrupt than even the Spanish Inquisition itself, the immaculate Savior utters not a word in self-defence. Finally, the base-hearted high priest adjures him by the living God, to tell whether or not he is the true Messiah, the Son of the Most High. Jesus acknowledges that he is the promised Shiloh, and emphatically intimates that he will finally appear in royal majesty, and with power and great glory be revealed in the clouds of heaven, to execute judgment upon the inhabitants of the earth. Caiaphas rends his clothes, and says, "What need we any further witnesses? ye have heard the blasphemy." And they all adjudge him worthy of death. They now begin to buffet him, and to spit in his face, and striking him with the palms of their hands, they cry out, "Prophecy unto us, thou Christ, who is he that smote thee!" The next morning they bind him, and take him to Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor, that he may ratify their sentence, and give orders for its immediate execution. Judas, the traitor, pierced with guilt to his inmost soul, now makes his appearance to as-

sert his Master's innocence, and throws down the petty reward of his treachery. Unmoved at this singular and incontrovertible evidence in favor of the innocency of the Savior, they proceed to Pilate's judgment-hall; but they refuse to enter it themselves, lest they be defiled by a heathen's house during the feast of unleavened bread. Pilate however comes to a balcony, and asks them what charge they prefer against this man. They assure the Governor that he is a malefactor, who deserves to be punished with death, which they cannot claim the prerogative to inflict.

After an examination of the Savior concerning his royalty, Pilate confesses to the Jews that he finds no fault in him at all. The Jewish priests and elders now the more vehemently accuse the Son of God, alleging that he began to present his corrupt doctrines in Galilee, stirring up the people to rebellion against the emperor. When Pilate hears that Jesus has been in Galilee, he forthwith sends him to Herod, the tetrarch of that country, who is now in the city of Jerusalem. To the interrogations of Herod, and the unjust charges of the wicked Jews, the Son of God utters not a word in reply. The impious Herod now mocks the Redeemer, and offers such insults and indignities as have characterized every step of the villainous proceedings in the trial of Jesus of Nazareth. Dressing him as a mock king, Herod sends again the Savior to Pilate, who remonstrates with the Jews in regard to the innocency of the Son of Mary.

Contrary to the advice of his wife and the dictates of his own conscience, the Governor, yielding to the importunities of the Jewish rabble, releases Barabbas and condemns Jesus to be crucified, and washing his hands in water, he protests his innocence touching the death of the guiltless Savior. The rebellious Jews cry out for his blood to be upon them and their children.

The Roman soldiers with adamant hearts of unbelief, now array the humble Nazarene in a purple robe, and having platted a crown of thorns, they rudely place it upon his head, and while from his torn temples issues forth his life-giving blood, they cry out, "Hail! King of the Jews." The impious Jews and the Roman guard now lead him away to be crucified. Compelling him to bear his own cross, they grossly insult, abuse, and villify the Son of God, and rudely hurry him to Golgotha, the place of execution. Becoming exhausted, under the unwieldy load, he faints and sinks down to the earth. They now compel one Simon, a Cyrenian, to assist in bearing his cross, and the procession again takes up the line of march. A number of pious women are following behind, beholding with deep, heart-felt pangs of sorrow, the merciless treatment of the immaculate Savior. In response to their sympathetic cries, he murmurs in mournful accents,—"*Weep not for me, but for yourselves and your children.*" Soon the procession reaches the hill-top where the soldiers offer him vinegar and myrrh, mingled with gall, and stripping off his clothes, they nail him to the cross, with a thief on either hand, with whom he is adjudged worthy to be crucified. As some of his vile enemies are passing by, they behold the Savior upon the Cross, and wagging their heads, they disdainfully cry out, "Thou that destroyest the temple and buildest it in three days, save thyself, and come down from the Cross." Likewise also the chief priests and scribes mock the suffering Redeemer, and tauntingly exclaim, "He saved others, himself he cannot save." Amid the awful agonies of the Cross, the benevolent Savior grows not forgetful of his friends.

Beholding the mother that bore him as she gazes with inexpressible anguish upon his pallid face, he turns to John, that beloved disciple who has often

leaned upon his breast, and exclaims, "Son, behold thy mother," and to his grief-stricken mother he says, "Mother, behold thy son." In behalf of his merciless foes whose hands are reeking in his own life's blood, he lifts up his voice, now tremulous in death—"Father, forgive them, they know not what they do." His own Father's frown now begins to darken upon him, and in inexpressible agony of soul he exclaims, "*My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me.*" All nature stands aghast. The great luminary of day refuses to behold the scene, and covers his face with a mantle of darkness.—The vail of the temple is rent in twain from top to bottom, the rocks are torn asunder, and the earth is convulsed to its very centre. Methinks angels from the eternal world are hovering around, amazed at the sight, while men and demons are delighted with the awful scene. Jesus expires upon the Cross, and enters the dreary regions of the tomb. A thrill of triumphant joy now runs through all the adverse powers of earth and hades. But as the third morn irradiates the face of nature, the most glorious intelligence that ever fell from the lips of mortal man, is borne from the receptacle of the dead. Jesus, the Messiah, has arisen from the grave, and life and immortality are unveiled to the world. The all-conquering Savior has despoiled death of its sting, and constituted the grave but the vestibule to a house not made with hands in the imperishable heavens. Having accomplished the superlatively grand and glorious object of his mission to this wicked and sin-polluted world, he now regains the Palace Royal of the Universe. Having proposed to the perishing family of man the charter of an immortal existence amid the matchless splendor of the heavenly Jerusalem, "cherubic legions guard him home, and shout him welcome to the skies." Arriving at the pearly gates of the celestial city, the glorious convoy of attending angels

cry—"Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of Glory shall come in." The responsive shout is heard within, "Who is this King of Glory?" At once the angelic guard replies, "The Lord, strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle. Lift up up your heads, O ye gates, even lift them up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of Glory shall come in." Again the cry is heard through all the ranks of heavenly powers, "Who is this King of Glory?" With acclamations of ecstasy the response is received.—"The Lord of Hosts, he is the King of Glory." The gates of the eternal city now open wide, and heaven resounds with songs of wondrous joy as the King of Glory enters the portals of the celestial mansions of the paradise of God.

Methinks the eternal anthems of the heavenly choir in glorious strains of ecstasy before unknown, reverberate from the golden pavement, while angelic legions fall prostrate and adore the King of Saints and Prince of Peace. The tall sons of the morning that sang together, and shouted for joy at the glories of creation's dawn, the seraphim encircled in light divine, and all the angelic hosts cast their glittering crowns at his feet and own him Lord of all. The eternal Father, enthroned in awful majesty, welcomes home the Son of his love, and coronates him King of kings and Lord of lords.

Here closes the history of the Savior of the world, as given in the sacred narratives of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. These testimonies close before the establishment of the kingdom of Christ on earth. Hence they do not present the laws of the New Covenant. While they contain all the evidence requisite to the most unflinching faith in the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth, yet they do not exhibit the terms of admission into his kingdom. These

must be established by consulting some other portion of the heavenly volume.

WM. M. ROE.

Buchanan, Mich., March, 1858.

For the N. W. Christian Magazine.

Our Position to American Slavery.

Since the world began, no man has died without leaving behind him some evidence of human infirmity. Enoch alone, of all the myriads of human kind, was perfect; and, to crown him with a distinction equal to the grandeur of a sinless life, God took him. But Adam, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, David, Solomon, Peter, and Martin Luther, died not without sin. These men were stars of first magnitude in the firmament of Heaven's sanctified ones; yet, in their weaknesses, imperfections, and gross delinquencies, they furnish a striking commentary on the wisdom of that maxim of the Great Teacher: "Call no man on earth master." When such lights fail, what shall we think of all the lesser lights, among the living or the dead?

But what a leader is our leader! What a lawgiver is our lawgiver! What a king our king! There is a measureless eternity past, yet he inhabits eternity. He is older than creation. Above us there is height without top; below us, depth without bottom; around us, extent without bounds—a measureless infinity; yet, our God fills infinity. In Him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead substantially. But, though in wisdom higher than all orders of being, whether celestial or terrestrial, and though the throne of the universe is His; yet our Lord is a man as truly as he is God, and feels for us in our infirmity and weakness, more than a brother's sympathy and love. He alone is our leader, and he watches—mercifully watches—with jealous care, every tendency in the human heart which would lead us to follow an earthly master, as we

follow him. Hence he says: "Be ye not called teacher." "One is your master, even Christ."

In approaching the subject of American Slavery, I am constrained thus to guard myself, because of my own admiration of one among us, to whom, next to my earthly father, I owe more than to any living man. In all Christian and manly graces, he occupies a proud and conspicuous position among earth's true nobility; in labors, in persecutions and sufferings for Christ's sake, he ranks among Christian heroes and martyrs; while the domestic bereavements, wherewith Heaven has afflicted and chastened him, call for our profoundest sympathy.

I shall first quote certain utterances of his, on the subject of American Slavery; and then shall proceed, most respectfully, to suggest wherein there is a manifest failure to meet the question, as respects the requirements of the age, and the duties of the Christian brotherhood.

"Slavery—that largest and blackest blot upon our national escutcheon; that many-headed monster; that Pandora's box; that bitter root; that blighting and blasting curse, under which so fair and so large a portion of our beloved country groans; that deadly upas, whose breath pollutes and poisons every thing within its influence." * * *—*Mill Harb.*, 1832, page 86.

"But that anomalous maximum of all evils, moral, political and religious, called Slavery, in Algiers, West Indies, Italy or America, I never defended; and, so long as the Bible lives, never can, and never will defend."—*Mill Harb.*, 1854.

If American Slavery is such an atrocious thing; and if, notwithstanding some form of servitude did exist in the Apostolic churches, then should not the line of discrimination be most clearly drawn between these two institutions, so diverse in their character,

and should not American Slavery be summarily thrust out of the church?

That there were slaves and slaveholders in the primitive churches, I have never doubted. "Let as many servants as are under the yoke, count their own masters worthy of all honor; and they that have believing masters, let them not despise them because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit." 1 Tim. 6: 6. This passage is a perpetual demonstration of the fact above stated, and I have never witnessed an effort to weaken its force, that could at all commend itself to the consciences of truly impartial and candid men.

It is proof of the possession of true nobility of heart, to be ready to admit the force of evidence which is in opposition to our prejudices; and equally so to be zealous that the poor and helpless shall enjoy every right, privilege and immunity with which Heaven has endowed them.

Taking the Bible for our guide, no good man was ever known to sell a slave. Joseph was sold into Egypt, but this was not the act of good men. When Abraham could no longer retain Hagar as a member of his family, he did not sell her; he manumitted her and her son. The law authorized the Jews to "buy bond men and bond women" of the heathen nations round about them; but gave them no license to sell to the heathen nations round about them. But we are not under the law. God permitted the Jews to do things which were wrong. "Because of the hardness of your hearts, Moses suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so." From the beginning it was wrong.

But, while the Jews were thus permitted to buy slaves, though they were never known to sell them; no Christian is reported in the New Testament to have either bought or sold a slave. The slave traffic is not, then, a Christ-

Page

ian institution. It is true the New Testament does not *specifically* forbid Christians to buy and sell slaves; but neither does it forbid horse races, cock fights, bull fights, gladiatorial exhibitions, circus shows, dancing, tippling, lottery, gambling, card playing, nor a thousand other useless, wicked and pernicious practices.

Slaves, as well as the souls of men, were among the articles of merchandise which the Revelation saw, in the mystic Babylon, at her final overthrow. Conformable to this fact, it was the Pope who first licensed the African slave trade. This slave trade, civilized nations have agreed to treat as piracy; and it is, perhaps, hard to say, why the domestic slave trade should fare better at the hands of our government.

In abolishing serfdom in Russia, the Czar ordains: first, *the freedom of marriage*. No serf can be forced in future to marry against his own desire. Second; no serf can be transferred from one village to another, against his will. In this the serf is made to enjoy the benefit of that law of the New Testament, "All things which ye would that men should do to you, do ye the same to them; for this is the law and the prophets."

The slave is an immortal being, for whom Christ died; and is to be treated as such. He has a right to moral, intellectual and religious culture; to home and friends. His right that the relations of father, mother, brother, sister, husband and wife, parent and child, should be inviolate, is as sacred as that of his master. For this reason, he is not, and cannot be, a mere chattel, a creature of purchase and sale. The leading idea, the ruling element of American Slavery, is, then, a false, inhuman and unchristian assumption. It assumes the right of the slaveholder to buy and sell slaves.

The sentence of the civilized world is against slavery. Its Broughams, Wilberforces, Lafayettes, Patrick Hen-

rys, Jeffersons, Franklins, Washingtons, all give it the sentence of their condemnation. In the Old Dominion, the experiment of slavery has been tried for more than a century; and its worn out lands, abandoned to sedge, dwarf pine, and foxtail; its dilapidated residences and decaying cities; the servility and effeteness that has fallen upon its *first families*; its seventy thousand mulattoes; its *poor white folks*, uneducated, unenterprising, improvident, and, too often, dissipated; all are so many voices, eloquent in denunciation of slavery.

But it is not to Jefferson nor Franklin; it is not to Wilberforce nor Webster, that a Christian goes for his rule of life. The Bible is our rule of life; and while the slaveholder keeps within the limits of its authority, he shall be treated as a brother by me. But, when I share with the slaveholder his evil report as well as his good report, because he is my brother, I protest, it is most unjust and dishonorable, that he should bring, upon himself and me, the unmitigated execration of christendom, by doing to his slave that for which he has not the shadow of authority in the Book of God.

Equally worthy of reprobation are our rulers and elders and scribes, who compel our whole brotherhood to hold in their communion, men who traffic in human flesh; but utterly dodge the responsibility of attempting to show that such a practice is scriptural. All slaveholders do not sell their slaves; but some do, and to sell a slave is not an act to be made a matter of discipline in any church south of Mason and Dixon's line.

"That anomalous maximum of all evils, moral, political or religious, called slavery, in Algiers, West Indies or America," which Brother Campbell "never defended;" "and, so long as the Bible lives, never can, and never will defend," is neither more nor less than that slavery which

now exists in the churches of this reformation. The old Joab has been too strong for David.

Do any say that the right of purchase and sale is essential to the perpetuity of slavery? I respond, Christianity never made itself responsible for the perpetuity of this institution. It never looked upon slavery with a friendly eye. "If thou mayest be free, use it rather." About the time of Justinian, it manumitted every slave in the Roman Empire, according to the testimony of Gibbon. I remain, very truly, your brother,

PARDEE BUTLER.

Ocena, Atchison co., K. T.,
March 1st, 1858,

"The Word is Nigh Thee."

Dwell'st thou with thine own people? are the joys.

The hopes, the blessings of "sweet home" thine own?
"The Word is nigh thee;" hear the sacred voice!

At morn, bow with thy loved ones round the throne;
At noon-tide read and pray; and in the hour
When evening's shades close round thee, let the truth

Subdue thy heart by its transforming power;
That thou, whom God has blessed, may'st serve him
from thy youth.

Affection's ties oft sunder, and the home
Of peace and love, sorrow and death can enter.
Art thou indeed a mourner? dost thou roam
Alone and sad, where late thy joys did center?
"The Word is nigh thee!" and though bitter grief
Makes all the future seem one day of sorrow—
Its words of peace shall grant thee sweet relief;
The night of pain and fear shall find a joyous morrow.

"The Word of God is nigh thee!" let it be
The lamp that o'er thy pathway sheds its light;
Then, through the mists of error, thou shall see
The way of truth, all radiant and bright,
In which of old the sons of God did go,
Leaning on Him who was their friend and guide;
Nor shall thy heart be faint, thy step be slow,
Till thou in Heaven, thy home, shall triumph by
their side.

The Word of God shall bless thee, in the hour
When human hopes and human friends shall fail;
It was in health thy portion, and its power
Is mightiest even in the gloomy vale.
No evil shalt thou fear while He is with thee;
The sting of death his hand shall take away,
His rod and staff shall comfort thee and cheer thee,
And thou with Him shall dwell through heaven's
eternal day.

For the N. W. Christian Magazine.

The Carnal Mind.

Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be—Rom. 8: 7.

Carnal is used for *worldly, fleshly, national, temporal*. It is applied in the Bible to weapons of war, (2 Cor. 10: 4,) to food and raiment, (Rom. 15: 27,) to worldly minded professors, (1 Cor. 3: 1,) to the Jewish national ordinances, (Heb. 9: 10,) to the Jewish law, (Heb. 7: 16,) indeed, the temple of God itself is called a "worldly sanctuary," (Heb. 9: 1.) The gospel is termed *the spirit*, (John 6: 63. 2 Cor. 3: 8,) and every thing pertaining to the gospel is called *spiritual*, and other things are called *carnal*, to distinguish them from the things of the spirit, or from the things of the gospel.

This phrase—carnal mind—is supposed to apply to the natures of all unconverted men, as if the Apostle were writing a treatise on the philosophy of human nature; but we are relieved from this error, when we observe the fact, that Paul makes the remark in the midst of an argument against Jewish notions; it, therefore, most clearly, has an anti-Jewish application. The "carnal mind" was no other than the mind produced by education and practice under the *carnal* ordinances of the Jewish law. To be born, educated and brought up under monarchical institutions, would naturally produce a monarchical mind; and to be reared under democratic institutions would produce a democratic mind; so, a training under the "carnal ordinances" of the Jewish nation produced a carnal mind. Unconverted Gentiles may, perhaps, be said to have carnal minds; but not in the same sense; and this passage can only be applied to the Jews, for to them alone Paul applied it. "The carnal mind is enmity against God." This "enmity," the same writer, in his letter to the Ephesians,

ascribes to "the law of commandments contained in ordinances." "Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, for to make in himself of twain one man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the Cross, having slain the enmity thereby." Ephes. 2: 15, 16. Now, if the law of commandments contained in ordinances was enmity, would not the mind produced by the law be of the same nature? This law, embracing only the children of the *flesh* of Abraham, was a "middle wall of partition" between Jews and Gentiles; therefore, when the law of the gospel was given, which embraced "both in one body," these carnal ordinances were enmity (opposed to) the now existing law of God; and the mind produced by these carnal ordinances was also enmity against the gospel, which had then become the law of God. The Jews would have the Gentiles in the Roman church circumcised, and keep the law of Moses; but Paul informs them that the carnal mind produced by the carnal ordinances was enmity against the law of God. The two systems were, in fact, enmity against each other. They were so opposite in their natures, that they could not both exist and be in force at the same time. Hence, Paul says: "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second." Heb. 10: 9.

Some Jews, who had embraced the gospel, through the prejudice of early education, and the influence of Jewish teachers, wished to add these carnal ordinances to the gospel; but Paul, in effect, informs them, that the two systems can never be reconciled, and that the carnal mind produced by the latter is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. Now, then, comes Paul's conclusion most naturally from these premises: "So then, they that are in the flesh, cannot please God." The unconverted Jew contended that

he was doing God's pleasure while he remained under that carnal or fleshly system; but Paul says, No. "They that are in the flesh cannot please God." The idea was, in substance, the same as that uttered by John the Baptist to the Jews: "Think not to say, we have Abraham to our father;" and as that uttered by Jesus to Nicodemus: "Ye must be born again."

Paul says, in the same connection: "The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Observe, here is one law making Paul free from another. "The law of the spirit of life;" or, in other words, the gospel, was the law of God, against which the Jewish mind was enmity. If that mind could not, by any means whatever, be subjected to the law of God, what was the Jew to do? Why, change his mind, of course; or, he must have a different mind; namely, a mind to obey the gospel; must get out of the kingdom of the flesh, and come into the spiritual kingdom of Christ; that is, he must repent and obey the gospel. And to say that a man has no power to change his own mind on any subject whatever, by the aid of the gospel, and all the motives furnished by it, from heaven, earth and hell, is a libel on God himself, who commands him to do it on pain of everlasting perdition. "The carnal mind is enmity," Mac-knight renders—*the mind of the flesh* is enmity; and in his commentary—"to mind the body in that manner is enmity against God." This places the enmity in our *actions*, and not in our *nature*; the text, then, furnishes not the slightest encouragement to the doctrine of total depravity.

In this chapter, the apostle uses the term *flesh* to denote the law, and the term *spirit* to denote the gospel. Let the inquirer turn to the 8th chapter of Romans, and substitute the words *law* for *flesh*, and *gospel* for *spirit*, and I

will give a synopsis of the first eight verses. The conscientious and timorous Jew, who had embraced Christianity, was required to walk after the gospel; and as he imagined he was bound by the law, he wished to keep them both; thinking he would be under "condemnation" if he did not keep the law also. Paul here takes issue, and, in the first verse, presents a counter proposition; namely, that "there is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, who walk after the gospel, though they walk not after the law." In the 2d verse, he asserts that the gospel had made him free from the law; so, of course, he would be under no condemnation, though he did not walk according to it. In the 3d verse, God had done, through the Gospel, by sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, what the law could not do. In the 4th verse, he asserts, that the object in sending his Son, to introduce the law of the gospel, was, that the righteousness of the law of the gospel might be fulfilled in Christians, who walk not after the law, but after the gospel. In the 5th verse, he teaches his Jewish brother, that the two systems could not be combined, as he and other Jews proposed; that they must be either Jews or Christians; that if they minded the things of the law (flesh), they would be the children of the flesh; and if they minded the things of the spirit (the gospel), they would be the children of the spirit; that is, they could not serve two masters—they could not be Moses' disciples and Christ's disciples at the same time. They that mind the laws of France are Frenchmen, and they that mind the laws of Spain are Spaniards. In the 6th verse, he teaches, that to be carnally minded (the mind of the carnal commandment) is death; but to be spiritually minded (the mind of the gospel) is life and peace. To render the whole overwhelming, in the 7th

verse, he informs the Jewish convert, who proposes to add the law to the gospel, that the carnal mind (the Jewish mind) was enmity against God; and could, by no means, be made to harmonize with the gospel, which had now become the established law of God. In the 8th verse, he comes to the following triumphant conclusion: "So they that are in the flesh (under the Jewish law) cannot please God." Thus Paul most lucidly teaches in the first eight verses of the 8th chapter of his epistle to the Romans.

J. I. LOWELL.

Querist's Department.

CAN WOMEN PRAY IN PUBLIC?

BROTHER BOGES: Is it scriptural for women to pray and exhort in a public assembly? If so, what will you do with the 34th and 35th verses of the 14th chapter of 1st Corinthians? You will confer a favor upon myself, and many others, by giving an essay upon the subject. Some of the sisters think it their duty to pray in public, while others think it is forbidden.

THOS. BUTLER.

Rockville, Indiana.

REMARKS.—The passage of Scripture referred to in the foregoing, reads as follows: "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." This is the only passage in the New Testament relied upon by those who oppose the praying and exhorting of females in public, to sustain their position. Several commentators

of note, among whom may be numbered McKnight, & "Olshausen," consider the teaching of the apostle conclusive on that side of the question, showing, as they think, clearly, that the sisters are in no wise to speak in the public assemblies. We think, however, that the position is one which is untenable, in as much as it violates one of the clearest rules of interpretation, as well as the whole spirit of the Christian religion. A fundamental rule of interpretation is, that whenever a meaning is put on any passage of Scripture, which conflicts with any other passage the meaning of which is obvious, it is evident such construction is erroneous. Now, the apostle clearly recognises the right and duty of the sisters to pray in public, inasmuch as he lays down rules and regulations for their so doing, in the 11th chapter of this same letter. Surely, Paul would not have directed the women in what manner they should be attired when they prayed in public, if he had believed it wrong for them to do so at all.

There is, however, another difficulty in the way. If the passage under consideration proves that women should not pray and exhort in public, it also proves that they should not *sing* in public. "Let your women keep silence in the churches," is just as exclusive in reference to singing as it is in reference to praying or exhortation. Indeed, there could be no such thing as the singing of "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs," among a class of Christians on whom silence was enjoined in the churches.

Again, this prohibitory interpretation of the passage is at war with the

great principle of *equality*, which is so distinct a feature in the Christian Church. Paul says of those who have become the children of God by faith in his Son, and have put on Christ by baptism, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." The apostle surely did not mean that Christians were no longer *men* and *women* after they became members of the church, but that they all had the same rights and privileges as the sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty. When a company of men and women believe in and obey the Lord Jesus, the Scriptures teach us that they are "all one in Christ Jesus," and that the only difference that ever can exist is the *delegated* authority given to the officers, by virtue of the *expressed* will of those composing the congregation. As far as singing and reading, and partaking of the Lord's supper, and praying and exhorting, all, both Jews and Gentiles, bond or free, male or female, have the same rights and privileges. Every member of the congregation who can sing to edification, is bound by every consideration of the gospel to do so; and by a parity of reasoning, we think the conclusion is irresistible, that those who have the ability to edify by their exhortations and prayers, are under the most imperious obligations to exercise their talents in that way, whether they be male or female; for, if they are Christians, they "are all one in Christ Jesus."

We have endeavored to show that the language of the passage can not consis-

tently be taken in that exclusive sense that would prohibit a majority of all the members of the body of Christ from participating in the exercises of public worship, and it only remains for us to show what is its scriptural import. The apostle, in the previous part of the chapter, had been speaking of prophecyings, speaking with tongues, and other manifestations of the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit, which was given, not only to the men, but also to the women, in fulfilment of a prediction of the prophet Joel. The possession of these gifts, no doubt, in some instances led them to forget that subjection to their husbands which the Scriptures elsewhere enjoined upon them, and to engage in dictatorial and disputatious harangues, and the propounding of questions which would lead to doubtful disputations. All these were prohibited under the Jewish law, and consequently were the more at variance with the opinions of the world. The apostle, therefore, taught them that, although they had come into the glorious liberty of the gospel, and consequently were entitled to all the privileges of the church; still, they were not to violate their obligations to their husbands, or outrage universal opinion, by usurping authority, or taking an active part in the disciplinary matters of the church. While they enjoyed the privilege to engage in all the devotional exercises, they had nothing to do with the administration of the law; or, in other words, with the *politics* of the congregation.

Duties, like truths, can not conflict with each other. The prohibition against a woman's teaching must not,

therefore, be so construed as to conflict with the implied duty to pray in public, contained in the directions given in the eleventh chapter. Neither must the right to pray, and sing, and exhort, in the congregation, be so understood as to counteract the natural modesty becoming the sex, nor the deference and subjection due from them to their husbands. The New Testament is a perfect harmony, and presents a perfect religion to the world. The church which it develops is the only heaven-ordained organization now submitted to the consideration of mankind. It provides, not for the abolition of any of those natural relations, but to elevate its votaries in the scale of moral existence, by superinducing a more faithful discharge of the social and civil duties of life, and at the same time a life of high toned devotion to God and his cause.

For the N. W. Christian Magazine.

Attributes of God.—No. 2.

WISDOM.

God is infinitely wise. Creation declares his wisdom. "O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all: the earth is full of thy riches. So is this great and wide sea, wherein are things creeping innumerable, both small and great beasts." There is wisdom in adaptation. In all created things there is adaptation. By His power the world was created. Wisdom aided by Omnipotence has covered it with beauty and life. The waters were separated from the land. Fish and the monsters of the deep are adapted to live beneath their billowy surface. Zones surround the earth. In one, Spring, with its flowers, fragrance and verdure ever lingers. Another, everlasting Winter,

holds in its frozen bands. In one, Spring and Winter alternate. The beasts, birds and insects of these different climates are wisely adapted to them. One class delights in the sunny south, where it finds climate and food suited to its peculiar wants. Another longs for the ice-bound regions of the north, and dies where summer reigns. Others can endure the two extremes; as the seasons change, they change.—At one time they are thinly clad, at another nature puts off the thin for one adapted to the season. God in his wisdom so ordains it. God's wisdom is displayed in the creation of man.—He was created holy, pure, and placed in a garden of unbounded beauty and loveliness. There was an adaptation of his physical, intellectual and moral nature to creation around him. He disobeyed—was cursed—the earth also to be in harmony with him was condemned. "Cursed is the ground for thy sake." In this respect man differs from all other living creatures. They were created, adapted, to the earth. But the earth, by the fiat of the Almighty, is made to harmonize with man's fallen, sinful nature. Wisdom unknown is here displayed. A worse punishment could not be inflicted upon fallen man than to allow him to remain in a garden of perpetual delight. God, whose understanding is infinite, knew this and cursed the earth. It is now in unison with man's moral, intellectual and physical nature.

Creation is wisely adapted to man's physical nature. He has an eye—to it light is adapted. The sun, ruler of the day, is only eclipsed at night to reveal ten thousand little starry suns. "Let there be light; and there was light." Man has an ear—for it sound was made. Nature abounds in sounds. The thunder, the cataract, the melody of the gentle evening zephyr, the songsters from a thousand woody groves—all speak to man of His wisdom. The fragrance of spring and the luscious

fruits of autumn joined hand in hand declare through the other senses of man, that "there is no searching of His understanding." All nature is vocal with voices speaking of the All-Wise Light. Air and sound are not dumb. There exhales from every blade of grass, pebble, sand and herb, silent but impressive tones, which address man and make wisdom evident.

Nature is adapted to the intellect of man. It can be classified. Astronomy is but a panorama of the heavenly bodies. What wonderful views of God's wisdom is here manifest. The lesser bodies moving around the larger—all in order and harmony. No collisions—no disturbance—wisdom formed the plan of the universe and keeps it in motion. The flowers, shrubs and trees of earth are scattered over its valleys and mountains. These classified and arranged by man, forms the science of botany. This work is calculated to draw out and cultivate the intellect—to give higher and loftier conceptions of Deity—to expand and dignify man. Astronomy, botany—all science declares the power, *wisdom* and goodness of God. Nor is this all.

He has given a system of morality suited to man's moral nature. Justice, reason and wisdom demand this. That system has been violated. Heaven's law has been broken; man is a rebel, a sinner, an outcast, doomed to death and destruction. No power or wisdom of his own can save him. No one in heaven, or earth, neither under the earth, is able to rescue him from his lost condition. Infinite wisdom alone is able. He formed a plan of redemption—a mystery to men and angels. Sends a mediator. This could not be a man for he would represent but one party—could not be an angel, for they are not of our nature, nor can they understand it. None but "Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God," "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge," can

perform this most glorious work of reconciliation. Of this wise plan—the “mystery of Godliness,” a mediator between God and man, God manifest in the flesh—the prophets of old “inquired and searched diligently,” and prophesied. Angels desired to look into it. They see its operations now but may never understand. This plan is revealed to the condemned world in the Bible. “Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought.” We are not redeemed with corruptible “silver and gold,” “but with the precious blood of Christ, as a lamb without blemish and without spot.” Oh now let all look up to God and admire that wisdom. Let Christ speak from Calvary, as he says in melodious accents, “It is finished.” Bow in humble submission and acknowledge his wisdom.

A. WILCOX.

Herman, Ohio.

For the N. W. Christian Magazine.

Dead in Trespasses and Sins.

“And you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins.”—Ephs. ii, 1. The term *dead* when applied to unconverted men, is thought to imply utter inability to obey the gospel. Even grave “Divines” are often heard to reason thus—as one literally dead is helpless, and has no power to raise himself from the dead, and sinners are said to be dead, therefore sinners are totally depraved and helpless, and have no power to do the will of God. Now to this stereotyped reasoning I must demur. Sinners are not literally dead, the word is therefore used figuratively; and to reason from a figure as if it were literal, is a most mischievous practice. Let us apply this reasoning to the term *fox*, thus,—A fox has fur, and Herod is called a fox, therefore Herod had fur; or to the term *tree*—a sinner is termed a corrupt tree, and a tree cannot walk, therefore a sinner cannot walk! These are grave

conclusions; but they have been clipped from the same web, and are not a whit more ridiculous.

Death when used figuratively, usually implies inactivity. To say that a people are asleep on the subject of temperance, or on the subject of education, conveys about the same idea as to say they are dead on these subjects; but *death* is a little stronger figure than *sleep*. When the abolitionist reported (with reference to the subject of abolition) that the people of Buffalo were dead, who imagined he intended to ascribe to them any native inability! If the expression, “dead in sin,” when applied to sinners, proves they cannot do a righteous act, the expression, “dead to sin,” when applied to Christians, does of course prove they cannot do a sinful act! Are you prepared, reader, for this unavoidable consequence?

But, suppose we admit, that the term *death* implies utter inability; then arises a very important enquiry of *When* were the Ephesians dead? Yes, when? that is the question. Was it before or after they *heard* the gospel of their salvation? Paul tells them in the 13th verse of the first chap. that they trusted after they *heard* the word of truth. It should be remembered that all the converts in the apostolic age were those that had never heard the gospel before, and well they might be dead; for it is most cheerfully admitted, that without the gospel, men are helpless; but I deny that men who have the glorious gospel of Christ are helpless! Men were told after conversion, that they had been dead, but it is a fact, worth volumes of human reasoning, that during the whole apostolic age, *the apostles never told a sinner, to whom they were preaching the gospel, that he was dead.* Reader, lay this fact up in your mind, and never let it slip.

Two things must be shown, before theologians can make the text prove total depravity—*first*, that the term

death necessarily implies natural inability to act; and, *secondly*, that men were said to be dead *after* they heard the gospel; and as there is not the slightest probability that any living man will be able to do either, we dismiss the subject. J. I. LOWELL.

"The General Missionary Society."

Under this caption we have received an article from the pen of Bro. Isaac Erret, which, owing to its great length, we cannot insert entire. The following extracts will, however, show the *conservativeness* of the writer on the subject of American Slavery, which seems to be its chief design. In reply to what we said in a previous number in reference to Bro. Beardslee and the Jamaica Mission, he says:

"The position of the society on the subject of slavery, was never spoken of in the Board, nor to this day has a word been said, that I know of, at any of its meetings, to indicate a 'position' on the slavery question, or any other question, except as the constitution of the society may express it. The society knows neither pro-slavery nor anti-slavery, nor anything else among men, save Jesus Christ and him crucified."

He goes on to state that Bro. Beardslee re-accepted his agency to raise funds:

"Knowing that the Board stands just where they did before."

He also says:

"The former corresponding secretary never had any official correspondence with Bro. Beardslee on the subject."

Now if we understand the matter, (and we have read the correspondence in question) the impression was made on Brother Beardslee, that the Secre-

tary was writing officially, and if he was, he judged the society was too pro-slavery for him to operate with. When he came to the Anniversary meeting, however, he found that the Board knew nothing of the correspondence, and of course he was as free to engage with it as at first. But we are confident that he spoke on all occasions as being opposed to slavery, and could not go on the mission, with the aid of slaveholder's money. So he talked to us we know; and we are assured he talked so to every one else.

Again Bro. Erret says:

"The society had no knowledge, and cared not to have any, as to his repudiation of American Slavery. They cared as little about his opinion on this as they did about his idea of an open Polar Sea, or of a tribe in Africa having tales."

What a sentiment! A *Christian* missionary society putting the views of their employee's in relation to that most heinous and God-defying of all crimes, the chattel-using of those for whom the Savior groaned and bled and died, on an equality with vain speculations in reference to the Polar Sea, or any other unimportant matter. Can it be possible that good men, Christian men, men who love God supremely, and their neighbors as themselves, can exercise such an extreme apathy in reference to four millions of men and women, who are debased to a level with the beasts of the field, chattelized, degraded, denied the benefits of education; robbed of their natural rights; the institution of marriage trampled upon! Can such a christianity benefit any one?

Again he says:

"Bro. Beardslee, with a frankness and a kindness which did him honor, stated to the society that in *view of public sentiment* in Jamaica, he desired to be able to preach the gospel there, unembarrassed by any opposition, such as he thought might arise if he were sustained by funds from slaveholders. He stated distinctly that *he did not say it was a right sentiment*; he distinctly *waived* the discussion of that; but the *fact* was as he stated, and he desired to look at things as they were, and prudently avoid giving any occasion to the enemy to speak reproachfully."

In this extract we find an admission on the part of the writer, that instead of the Board not knowing or caring whether Bro. Beardslee was pro-slavery or anti-slavery, that he did decline going to Jamaica, unless he could go without the aid of the slaveholder's money. But the most remarkable feature of the extract, is the position in which it places Bro. Beardslee himself. If, in the presence of the Board, he declined endorsing that public opinion in Jamaica, which would not allow him to go there as a missionary, while sustained by slaveholder's money, he acted very different from what he did when calling upon anti-slavery brethren, and congregations, soliciting their aid in sustaining his mission. We cannot and *do not* believe that he could practice such duplicity. We *know* that in some circles he represented himself as a consistent anti-slavery man, and we shall be slow to believe that he was either afraid or ashamed to avow his sentiments everywhere. We think, however, in justice to himself, it would be well for Bro. Beardslee to define him-

self clearly on the subject. If Bro. Errett is correct, the brethren who have contributed so liberally to sustain the mission ought to know it, that in future they may make a wiser disposition of their money. If on the contrary, we are correct, if Bro. Beardslee is, as we have supposed, a real *heart-felt* abolitionist, one who hates slavery from principle, and not merely "prudentially," the anti-slavery brethren want to be assured of it beyond any cavil, and when so assured, he can be *sustained* independent of any existing organization. As *yet*, we have no doubt in reference to the genuineness of Bro. Beardslee's anti-slaveryism.

In another paragraph Bro. Errett says he had never read a word of Bro. Beardslee's articles on Jamaica, and that so far as his acquaintance with the Board extended, they had not been read by them. It seems strange that none of the Board should have read the first of the Jamaica articles, inasmuch as it was published in the "Age" before it fell into the hands of the former Corresponding Secretary, but stranger still that Bro. Errett should be able to know just what they had read and what they had *not* read on that subject when he had had no conference with any of them in reference to slavery in or out of Jamaica, and cared nor knewed not whether Bro. Beardslee was pro-slavery or anti-slavery.

After quoting from the *Magazine* our expressions of joy that the A. C. M. S. presented a more favorable aspect on the slavery question he again remarks:

"I confess it grieves me to see these statements, and to know that such a spirit as they breathe, prevails to any extent among our brethren.— This attempt to pin the great Missionary work to the Anti-Slavery cause is, I cannot help saying, unworthy the cause of Primitive Christianity which we plead. Where in the Evangelists is there to be found such a connection of apostles or evangelists? Where in Acts are Barnabas, or Stephen, or Philip, or Paul rejoiced over, on any such ground? Where in any inspired epistle is this made a ground of exultation that a preacher of the gospel is an anti-slavery man, or at least *one* apostolic mission is established which 'the slave holder dare not pollute with his unrighteous mammon?'"

The spirit manifest among some of the brotherhood which grieves Bro. Errett, rejoices us. We confess it is the only thing that gives us encouragement in this corrupt age. If there were not a few professors of religion who could withstand the *golden* influences of the slavery power we should lose all confidence in men if not in Christianity. He asks for a scripture precedent: we answer the whole spirit of the gospel is anti-slavery. Carry out the great principle of love to all men, commensurate with self-love, and slavery would be abolished from the face of the earth. Christ came to the earth to "break every yoke and to let the oppressed go free," and it would be as vain to look for sanction in the New Testament for *apathy* on the part of the evangelists and apostles in reference to human oppression, as in reference to drunkenness, adultery, robbery or murder.

Again he says:

"I am an anti-slavery man. This

is known to the brethren, east, west, north and south. But I am not an extremist. All my intimate anti-slavery friends know that I never was the friend of church secession doctrines, that I have always insisted that slave holding was not a sufficient reason for disturbing church fellowship."

As far as "church secession doctrine" is concerned we have always opposed it as strongly as Bro. Errett, on the ground that the duty of the anti-slavery brethren was to labor to *reform* the church in reference to that subject. But if slave holders and their apologists should prove irreclaimable, it certainly will be the duty of all Christians to withdraw from them, as the most gross violators of Christian law. Bro. Errett says he is an "anti-slavery man." We have always rejoiced in the belief that he was such, and that the poor down-trodden slave had so able an advocate. But what is it to be "anti-slavery?" *Anti* means "*opposed to*." Is it possible Bro. Errett is opposed to any thing so trifling and insignificant as not to be "sufficient reason for disturbing church fellowship?" So strongly opposed too, that his "anti" slaveryism is known all over the land, "east, west, north and south!" It does seem to us that either slave-holding is a sin of sufficient magnitude to warrant the disturbing of church fellowship, or else Bro. Errett has been opposing a very small matter indeed!— From our stand-point we look upon slave-holding as being the "maximum of all evils," and consequently not to be tolerated in the church. Slave-holders should be labored with kindly and affectionately, and with all long suffering," but if they will not reform

their lives, and as far as possible make restitution for the wrong they have done in holding their brethren as chattles, the fellowship of the congregation should be withdrawn from them.

Bro. Errett says in another paragraph:

"I trust that our brethren in the North, whatever their views on the subject of slavery, will not suffer Satan to beguile them into a neglect of their duty to send the Gospel into all the world, or into a belief that the Gospel and anti-slavery doctrine are identical! or that the utterance of the usual cant about 'the price of blood,' 'the sighing of the slave,' &c., &c., is equal to the employment of the heart, purse and life in the service of the Lord."

That it is the duty of all the followers of Christ to consecrate the heart and purse and all that they possess to the work of the Lord is self-evident to every Bible student. But it remains to be shown that the sustaining of any society or preachers who wink at, and apologize for, American Slavery, is the work of the Lord.

Satan sometimes transforms himself into an angel of light, and when he can effect his purposes better by so adulterating Christianity as to divest it of its regenerating and sanctifying influences, on the hearts and lives of its professors, than by openly opposing all form of religion, he is always ready to assume that position.

The gospel and anti-slavery are so far "identical" that wherever the gospel is preached and embraced in its purity and simplicity, it *always* produces anti-slavery sentiments, and where slavery exists, anti-slavery *action*.—To suppose that a man can possess the

spirit of the gospel, and a pro-slavery spirit at the same time, is to suppose an impossibility. It is just as paradoxical as to speak of a sober drunkard, or of devout profanity! Just think of the spirit of Christ leading a man to sell his own children, begotten in adultery! Separating husbands and wives, parents and children, and shutting forever from those for whom Christ died, the Lamp of Life—the Gospel of God! Whenever Satan succeeds in "beguiling" the church into the idea that slave-holding is not incompatible with true Christianity, and in "beguiling" such preachers as Bro. Errett into the belief that they can be anti-slavery men and at the same time fellowship slave-holders, he will have succeeded in deluding the world to an alarming extent.

Again he says:

"We send no man out to preach slavery nor anti-slavery! but as said before, to preach the gospel of which Paul said, that if an angel from heaven should preach any other, let him be accursed."

Again he says:

"Come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty. The world is perishing; let us give them the bread of life. We appeal to our editors and scribes not to embarrass this work with side issues. And we hope they will remember that while the Executive Board will not suffer themselves to be mixed up with the prevailing controversies on the slavery question, it being no part of their work, they have enough horror of slavery to refuse to bend a suppliant knee before a false public sentiment, and to scorn the *driver* whether editor or scribe, who may attempt to rule them under the lash of northern or southern domination."

The intention of Bro. Errett in the last part of this paragraph is apparent to the most superficial reader. His insinuations are however wholly gratuitous. We know of no anti-slavery "scribes" or "editors" who have any desire to compel the "Executive Board" or any other body of men to "bow the suppliant knee" to any other than to the Lord Jesus, or to acknowledge any other "rule" than that of the "one Lord" who has been coronated King of kings and Lord of lords, who has enjoined upon all his followers "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." If Bro. Errett and those he professes to represent, have so much horror of slavery and so much scorn for the "driver" and his "lash," when spoken of figuratively, we should think they would have scorn enough for *literal* slavery, and the *literal* lash to, remember those of their brethren who are in bonds as bound with them; and scorn enough for the *literal* "driver" to keep him out of the church and exclude him from their Christian fellowship.

It is true, as Bro. Errett says, the "world is perishing," but are not the slaves of the south a part of the "perishing world?" Is not the soul of the slave as precious in the sight of God as the soul of the master? Is it pleasing in his sight to sell a part of the members of the church away from all church privileges in order to furnish funds for the Missionary Society, or for any other purpose? Is not such money the price of blood? Is not a believing slave a disciple of Christ?—We know Bro. Errett will say "Yes!" Will not the Savior say to the slave-

holder in the day of judgment, "I was hungry and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty and ye gave me no drink; I was a stranger and ye took me not in; naked and ye clothed me not; sick and in prison and ye visited me not"—"Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me." It will not do, Bro. Errett, for us to take a one-sided view of the "perishing world," of which you speak so eloquently and so justly. That gospel and that religion which upholds the slaveholder in his iniquitous course, and denies the right of the poor, down-trodden slave to his labor, his family, and especially to the Bible, is a spurious religion and a spurious gospel; a gospel that will bring down the anathema of heaven upon the heads of those who preach it; a religion that will prove unavailing in that day when we shall all appear at the judgment seat of Christ.

We exceedingly regret that one who has formerly advocated the cause of the oppressed with such ability as Bro. Errett has done, should so far counteract the good influence he has exerted as to write such an article as this from which we have so liberally quoted. We can stand anything from avowed enemies, but we confess it grieves us to be stabbed in the house of a friend. It aggravated the injustice inflicted upon our Savior that he was betrayed by a Judas—by one of his professed friends. We should, however, have published the article entire had it not been for its great length. Still we think the extracts we have made do ample justice to the writer. Indeed, we have been careful to select his most pointed re-

marks, however severe or personal their character. Still we must say we are grieved to see the influence of a slave-holding oligarchy over the great men, and leaders of the church, as well as state. We pray heaven that the Redeemer's Kingdom may be so extended that slavery and everything else that is inimical to the peace and happiness of the human family, may be taken out of the way, and universal man, may be saved from the thralldom of sin and the beguilements of Satan.

J. B.

For the N. W. Christian Magazine.

Jamaica Mission.

LETTER FROM ELDER J. O. BEARDSLEE.

DEAR BRO. BOGGS:—Though I have recently forwarded a pretty full report to our Cor. Secretary, which I presume will be placed before the brotherhood, I will send you, by the present opportunity, a brief statement of our voyage, reception, and present circumstances.

We left New York, per steamer "Star of the West," on the 20th of January, having been detained in the city three weeks. We were seven days and six hours from port to port. Our vessel rolled and tossed very much, though we had no severe storms. We were sea-sick during the entire voyage. Sister Dille proved a better sailor than either of us, and acted a sister's part in administering to our comfort. One chief comfort was that our good ship moved gallantly on towards her place of destination, promising a speedy relief to our sufferings. Our barque safely moored, we soon lost in the embrace of kind friends, all our unpleasant sensations.

We were received, by all parties, with all the warmth of kindly feeling that we anticipated, and soon found ourselves quite at home again. The contrast in the appearance of the city

and people to those we had just left, was certainly very striking, on our first arrival, but a few days served to restore our former appreciation of things here, and to establish our preference for this sunny isle.

On the first Lord's day after our arrival, I addressed my old flock, by request of its present pastor, and received a cordial welcome. I was soon pressed with invitations to supply various pulpits in the city which I have been filling in their turn. I am besides delivering a connected series of discourses, having obtained the use of the largest Baptist chapel in the city for a service in the P. M. of each Lord's day. The subjects of the series are:

I. The Bible a revelation of God's will, for the recovery of man from his fallen, ruined state.

II. Essential pre-requisites to a right understanding of God's word.

III. Jesus of Nazareth, the promised Messiah of the Jews and the Savior of the world.

IV. Jesus, the Savior of man, and only priest of the present dispensation. (in continuation of the III.)

V. Jesus, the King and Law-giver, &c.

The third of the series I deliver to-morrow, intending to continue on as long as circumstances seem to warrant. Present appearances are in favor of a good hearing. The congregation worshipping at the chapel which I occupy, has been nearly broken up, and they have no stated preaching at present.—My hearers are from different churches and from the outsiders. The congregation expect their former minister from England soon, so that I do not look for a location there. It is, however, a favorable opening for us at present, and before a change becomes necessary, I trust a good impression may be made.

My services for the present are necessarily gratuitous, and may be for some time to come. I hope therefore

that our friends will be prompt in their remittances, to save us from embarrassment in our work. They should not forget that whatever amount of funds may be in the hands of the Board they can only remit to me such monies as are contributed expressly for the *Jamaica Mission*, and from sources untainted by contact with Slavery. My mind is unalterably made up to suffer want and privation, rather than receive aid from those who hold their fellow-creatures in bondage. I do not think the friends of the oppressed would be willing even to place a temptation to do so in my way.

Praying that you may be prospered in all proper efforts to do away with oppression and sin in any form,

I remain, yours in faith and hope,

J. O. BEARDSLEE.

Kingston, Jamaica, W. I., Feb. 27, 1858.

For the N. W. Christian Magazine.

Nature's Sermon.

There is something gloriously beautiful in a calm, peaceful spring Sabbath. To wander away from the cold-hearted brick walls, and repose beneath the shade of a giant tree, listening to the warbling of praises to God by the notes of feathered songsters; feeling the gentle breeze upon one's fevered brow; marking the grand view of the fair town, that seems to repose so sweetly, guarded by the green meadows around it; catching, now and then, the chimes of distant bells, and the far off cascade. There, beneath that tree, nature preaches a sermon the sons of men never equalled.

Far away in the distance, the mountain hills seem towering to heaven, saying, in a silent, but heart-reaching tone, "Rise up from the earth, O, thou mortal! and put on your armor; fight bravely for the crown, and the home we can almost see."

The fields, covered with green grass, that ere long will be ripe for the scythe,

saith, in its gentle, wavy voice, "Strive to grow in those virtues that will ripen and fit you for the harvest that is coming; or else thou wilt be called an unfruitful field, and the reapers neglect to gather thee into the garner."

The cool breeze murmurs in my ear: "I go to all; the rich, the poor; the proud, the humble; the sick, the well; the sad, the gay; fanning their brows as gently as thine; bringing to their ears the same sweet music; and each, according to his passions, has welcomed me as gladly as thou. So, too, shouldst thou go, bearing the music of salvation from heaven to sinners; be they rich, poor; sick, well; proud, humble; sad, or gay; and thou wilt be welcomed, by the rich, proudly; by the poor, humbly; by the sick, joyously; and the well, though they heed thee not now, will heed thee hereafter; the sad, with a faint, weary smile; and the gay, with joy that thou wilt yield them gladness in a better world."

Then comes the song of the woodland warblers, saying: "Go, as they have told thee: but, as thou goest, sing praises; for thine will be a glorious mission, and a happy heart will attend thee; therefore, sing gaily, and they, to whom thou goest, will welcome thee all the more gladly, that they feel, by thy sweet notes of praise, that the service thou hast entered is not one of *War, Gloom and Death*; but one of *Joy, Peace and Life*."

ETHA.

For the N. W. Christian Magazine.

Our Cause in Kansas.

LETTER FROM ELDER PARDEE BUTLER.

BRO. BOGGS:—*Dear Sir*: Our congregation meeting in Pardee, Atchison Co., Kansas Ter., is growing apace.—As our population increases, as the alarms of war cease to be heard, and as the people settle down into the more quiet and ordinary pursuits of life, the necessity for evangelical labor is more

and more felt. The field is white, but there are no laborers.

Our first great want is a thorough exploration of Kansas. We need to search out our brethren, who are scattered broadcast over the land; we need to arouse them from this sleep of death into which so many of them are falling; gather them together, and induce men who can sing, pray, exhort, teach or preach, to look after these poor sheep in the wilderness. To invest money in Kansas lands and corner lots is a good speculation, but still better to invest in prayers backed up by the necessary "material aid" for the planting here that glorious institution, which, like the foundation of a pyramid stands the basis of that growing civilization which is the pride and boast of our race.

We shall first do something for ourselves, and then when our strength is exhausted, we may appeal to the brotherhood, whether they have any practical sympathy for Kansas; "bleeding" not by the assaults of an earthly foe, but by the wiles of that un-earthly prince of "Border Ruffians," that with the savage hate of a roaring lion now seeks by means of drinking, gambling, speculation, worldly excitement, and general dissipation, to drown the people in destruction and perdition.

Praying that love to God and love to man may reign supreme in the hearts of all the Lord's people.

I am, very truly, your brother,

PARDEE BUTLER.

Ocala, Atchison Co., K. T., Mar. 1858.

From the Gospel Advocate.

Mission to the Cherokees.

DEAR BRETHREN:—After 20 years absence from the Cherokee people, devoted to the good work of evangelizing in Tennessee, Kentucky, Alabama, etc. we have, by the good Providence of God, our Father, resumed our missionary labors in the Cherokee Nation West.

After six weeks toilsome and expensive travel we found ourselves, on the 24th of November, in the midst of old friends and hospitable relatives. Our location we consider a favorable one. We are about 26 miles west of Fayetteville, Ark., about half way between the Southern and Northern boundaries of the Nation, and some three miles from a Christian Church composed in part of citizens of the Cherokee Nation.

We have named our place "*Christian Mission*." Heaven grant it may be worthy of so good and so glorious a name! We have good land, good water, good health and good neighbors. Thank the Lord for the many good things of this world! Our premises cost us five hundred dollars, and by expending one hundred dollars, can be made quite comfortable and productive. Thus by expending some fifteen hundred dollars, embracing outfit, travel, purchase, etc., we are prepared to commence with the new year (1858) the first *Christian* mission among the red children of the new world. Thank the Lord, we still have food and raiment and pray we may be content therewith!

Our first missionary discourse was delivered on Lord's day, between Christmas and new year's day, in a public school house of our own neighborhood, to a respectable congregation of red, white and black people. The way to eternal life as revealed in the 6th of Romans, was the subject. While we labored to prove and illustrate that conformity to Christ in his crucifixion, burial, resurrection and glorification is the only and certain way to eternal life, the audience seemed much interested. Elder Jones, the Baptist missionary, with whom I was acquainted in the old Nation, was present and concluded the services with fervent prayer. Last Lord's day I and family attended preaching at the same place, and heard a son of Elder Jones on Reconciliation. He was born and raised among the Cherokees, and is said to be

the best interpreter in the Nation.— Sunday before Christmas I preached twice in the church at Fayetteville.— We meet, occasionally, with the church near the line.

Dear brethren, we have given you this brief history, that you may know where we are, and that we are still saying and doing something in our humble way to advance the Indian Mission. We often think of former times and associations. The college bell, the church bell, the lecture bell, the roar and whistle of the train, are heard not. The crowding and anxious students, male and female, and the moving masses of the city, are seen not in this far-off Western country; but the hope of these things for our children gives us some relief. Farewell. May God bless you all. Your brother in Christ,

J. J. TROTT.

P. S. Correspondents will address Elder J. J. Trott, Cincinnati, Washington Co., Ark.

Christian Mission, Cherokee Nation, Jan. 10, '58.

For the N. W. Christian Magazine.

Life.

Life is what we make it. Youth its seedtime; Manhood the summer, which ripens its fruit; Old Age the harvest.

What shall we make that harvest? The gathering to the great storehouse of unripe, withered or decayed fruit; or shall the gatherer walk through a barren field, and find that the blossoms faded, leaving no fruit-germ behind?

Then, youth, waste the passing moments; sow no seeds of knowledge or truth; let the two great harvest fields, Mind and Heart, produce naught but useless weeds, brought and dropped in their bosoms by a passing breeze. And when youth reaches its prime, let its trials and triumphs, like showers and sunbeams, nurture those weeds. Then mark you how they grow. Rejoice if you will, for they tower above and hide the grain sown by another at the same time, and have choked down

every good and useful seed that chanced to drop among them.

But, if you would have the gatherers return laden with the richest and rarest productions; watch well those fields; sow good seed, and haste to pluck up every weed, ere it has gained too deep a root. Then, when manhood's sorrow and joy come, they will strengthen only the good and true.

Yes, mark you well the seed that is springing in Mind and Heart, lest your prime will find only weeds, and hastening to destroy them, and plant good seed in hotbeds, old age overtakes you, and the harvest is withered fruit.

ETHA.

For the N. W. Christian Magazine.

Harrison Street Congregation.

TO THE DISCIPLES—*Greeting:* You have heretofore been very favorable to us, (the Disciples worshipping on Harrison street,) in taking up collections in your congregations, and also, in some instances, by appropriations as individuals, to assist us in removing the debt hanging over our place of worship; for all of which you have our profoundest gratitude. But, as the debt is still something on the rise of nine hundred dollars, we hope, as formerly, to be still remembered in your charities,—that those whom God has made stewards of an earthly bounty, will not neglect us in their distributions.

All sums appropriated for the aforesaid purpose, may be safely sent in the care of Elder B. FRANKLIN, editor of "The A. C. Review," or to Elder JOHN BOGGS, editor of the "N. W. Christian Magazine."

Elders: STEPHEN BURGESS,
ISAAC HUDSON,
W. D. GOFF.

Cincinnati, O., March 18, 1858.

It is more blessed to give than to receive.

Come Out of Sodom.

The following quaint piece is from a volume by GEORGE WITHER, an English poet, who flourished about two centuries ago:

My Soul, come let us go,
In Sodom longer linger not;
Look not behind thee so,
But call to mind the wife of Lot.
Let nothing here
To thee be dear,
Or captive thy desires;
God will thereon,
When we are gone,
Rain down consuming Fires.

Though with a glorious light,
The sun thereon begins to rise,
A dreadful Storm ere night,
Her careless dwellers with surprize.
Come, come away,
Without delay;
Quite cast her out of mind:
For worth thy thought,
In her there's nought,
Which thou shalt leave behind.

God's mercies they contemn;
His kindness with despites repay;
Still when He speaks to them,
They turn their heads another way.
When He intreats,
Reproves, or threatens,
To heed it they disdain:
Or with a scoff,
They put it off,
And obstinate remain.

God here hath pitched His Tent;
And here, had they His council took,
To dwell for ever meant;
But they, alas! have Him forsook.
This, which a place
Like Eden was,
Is now defil'd with sin;
Still Fruit it bears,
That fair appears;
But 'tis all dust within.

Then from this cursed Plain
Flee, to those Everlasting Hills,
Where safe thou may'st remain,
And whereon thy Redeemer dwells.
Here make no stay;
For though there may
In Zoar safety seem,
When such Storms be,
Secure are we
Nowhere, except in Him.

This is their fatal day,
Which day, perhaps, may last a year;
And true Repentance may
Avert the Doom approaching near.
But, I much doubt,
That trifled out
This Day of Grace will be:
Therefore in fear,
And danger here,
Our stay will always be.

Editor's Table.

THE LEAVEN WORKING! We learn by the *Times* of 17th March, that Mrs. Catharine Hudnut had just liberated her slave "Charlotte." They are both members of the Christian church, and both reside in this city. Sister Hudnut has been for some time a reader of the *Magazine*!

CHALLENGES' ILLUSTRATED MONTHLY. We have received the first three Nos. of this new periodical. It is, we think, in every respect worthy the patronage of the brotherhood. It contains sixty pages, a size smaller than the *Harbinger*—good paper, clear large type, and is just what its title indicates, an "illustrated miscellany." Single copy, \$1.00 per annum; or 50 cents for six months. Address, James Challen & Sons, Philadelphia:

CAN YOU SPARE A DOLLAR? If so, read the call signed by the Elders of the Harrison street congregation. Their meeting-house debt ought to have been paid long ago. They have struggled hard, but they still owe about \$900. Surely that amount might be raised, hard as the times are. Who will pledge themselves to give one dollar, on or before the first of July? Who will give five dollars? Let us hear from you, brethren.

NEW CORRESPONDENTS. We are happy to present our readers with several communications from new correspondents. Elder J. I. Lowell is one of the oldest and most influential evangelists in the State of New York. He has the admirable quality in a good writer, of expressing much in a few words.

Elder Pardee Butler is also an efficient laborer in the field, and will be remembered by the most of our readers as the Brother who suffered so much persecution in Kansas, because he was from principle